



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/617,361	07/17/2000	David N. Harris	0013-011	8110

40972 7590 07/06/2007
HENNEMAN & ASSOCIATES, PLC
714 W. MICHIGAN AVENUE
THREE RIVERS, MI 49093

EXAMINER

ALVAREZ, RAQUEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3622

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/06/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/617,361

Applicant(s)

HARRIS, DAVID N.

Examiner

Raquel Alvarez

Art Unit

3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2007 and 04 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 60-113 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 60-113 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to communication filed on 4/17/07 and 6/4/07.
2. Claims 60-113 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 67, 82, 105, 107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Upon further review of the specification, support for notification to the account holder being disabled was not found.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 67 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The language "operative to wait for said account-holder to initiate said connection with said account-holder" is confusing. This claim was examined similar to claim 82 which includes waiting for the account-holder to initiate communication with the computer system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

8. Claims 60-65, 72, 74-80, 87, 89-95, 102 and 104-113 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Blonder et al., patent number 5,708,422 (hereinafter Blonder).

Blonder teaches a method for verifying a commercial transaction comprising: receiving a transaction approval request from the merchant, the request including the account number (col. 2, lines 60-65, lines 45-50, col. 4, lines 55-65, col. 5, lines 5-10),. electronically verifying the approval request with the account holder via a separate communication from the merchant (see at least col. 2, lines 50-55, col. 3, lines 5-15, 25-35, col. 5, lines 40-50, col. 6, lines 50 - col. 7, line 5) and transmitting an approval to the merchant pursuant to a selectively enabled verification function (col. 3, lines 1-5, col. 10, lines 35-37).

Blonder also teaches a computer system for verifying a commercial transaction comprising: a processing unit for processing data and code, a memory device for storing data and code including a merchant communications module to facilitate a connection with the merchant for receiving a transaction approval request including a complete account number (fig. 1 , col. 2, lines 60-65, lines 45-50, col. 4, lines 55-65, col. 5, lines 5-10),. an account holder communications module operative to facilitate a separate connection with the account holder for verifying the request (see at least col. 2,

Art Unit: 3622

lines 50-55, 01. 3, lines 5-15, 25-35, col. 5, lines 40-50, col. 6, lines 50 - col. 7, line 5)., and an authorization module responsive to receipt of the approval request and transmitting an approval to the merchant only if the approval request is verified by the account holder (fig. 7, fig. 9, fig. 10 (at least), col. 10, lines 35-37).

Blonder also teaches the authorization module includes an interactive verification module responsive to the approval request and initiating a connection with the account holder and verifying the transaction request by prompting the account holder to verify the request (col. 7, line 65 - col. 9, line 30)., sending an electronic message to the account holder via a network interface and receiving a reply to the electronic message (col. 6, lines 55 - col. 7, line 3, col. 9, lines 10-30)., a telecommunications device where the interactive verification module places an automated telephone call to the account holder and includes establishing a telephone connection with the account holder, reciting a portion of the request to the account holder, and receiving verification instructions from the account holder (col. 8, lines 10-55)., the authorization module is responsive to instructions from the account holder to automatically verify subsequent transaction approval requests without further input from the account holder and instructions for enabling or disabling the electronic verification (col. 5, line 30-45, col. 7, lines 1-10, col. 14, lines 35-67)., the authorization module includes a master verification module responsive to the lapse of a predetermined time period and operative to disclaim the request if the request has not been verified by the account-holder (col. 7, lines 5-15, 01. 10, lines 5-20, lines 55-65)., the transaction approval request is a verification request from a third-party financial institution and the authorization module

transmits indicia of verification to the third party institution (col. 5, lines 30-35, col. 9, lines 25-30).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 66, 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blonder.

While Blonder teaches the interactive verification module requires authentication from the account holder prior to reciting a portion of the approval request (col. 8, lines 45-50), Blonder does not teach the use of an authentication code for this purpose. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used an authentication code prior to reciting a portion of the approval request in Blonder since, at least, personal identification numbers, or pin, are well known in the art for identifying/authenticating customers (claims 15,25). Use of the pin authentication would have at least reduced the processing and storage demands of voice recognition particularly considering the number of customers the system would need to serve.

11. Claims 67-71, 73, 82-86, 88, 96-101 and 103 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blonder in view of Joao et al. (6,529,725 hereinafter Joao)

Blonder teaches establishing a connection with the account holder, authenticating the account holder, transmitting a portion of the approval request, and receiving verification instructions from the account holder with respect to the approval request (col. 8, lines 10-55), but does not show waiting for a connection initiated by the account holder. Joao teaches the account holder can contact the central processing office or processing center to approve the transaction (col. 7, lines 12-18, col. 19, lines 1-7, col. 19, line 65 - col. 5). It would have been obvious to one having communication with the system as in Joao since this would have provided the customer the time he/she needed to decide whether to approve/disapprove the transaction. It also would have been obvious to have transmitted a notice to the account holder when the transaction approval request was disclaimed as in Joao since this would have provided a complete record of activity for the account holder.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


Art Unit: 3622

Point of contact

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raquel Alvarez whose telephone number is (571)272-6715. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric w. Stamber can be reached on (571)272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Raquel Alvarez
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3622

R.A.
6/20/2007